

## REMARKS

The undersigned attorney and the Examiner held a phone interview on September 8, 2006. The Examiner has issued an Interview Summary that is in accord with that interview. This response and Amendment is likewise believed to be in accord with that interview.

## OBJECTIONS TO THE SPECIFICATION

The Examiner objected to the disclosure at page 5, line 16, based on a misspelling; the specification has been amended to recite "methylnpiperazine."

Claims 5 and 12 have been objected to based on the positioning of the connector "or." Claims 5 and 12 have been amended.

Claims 10 and 17 have been objected to because of a misspelling. These claims have been amended to correctly recite "electrophile."

## REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has rejected claims 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Claims 5 and 12 were rejected for the parenthetical statement "or -perhydroazepine." Inasmuch as the terms "-hexamethyleneimine" and "-perhydroazepine" are synonymous, the term "-perhydroazepine" has been deleted.

Claims 6 and 8 have been rejected because terms lack antecedent basis. Claim 6 has been amended to simply recite "the functionalized styryl compound," and claim 8 has been amended to recite "the functional group A."

Claims 13 and 15 have been amended because claims lack antecedent basis. Claim 13 has been amended to recite "the functionalized styryl compound," and claim 15 has been amended to recite "the functional group A."

Claims 8 and 15 have been rejected because of an error in the formula. These claims have been amended in a fashion consistent with the formula set forth on page 5 of the written description.

### REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by any one of U.S. Patent Nos. 3,725,368 (Morrison), 3,862,251 (Strecker), and 4,497,748 (Vitus). According to the Examiner, these references disclose an anionic polymerization initiator prepared by reacting organolithium compound with divinyl benzene. Because the Examiner considers divinyl benzene to qualify as a vinyl-functionalized styryl compound, the Examiner believes that the invention set forth in claims 1 and 3 lack novelty. Applicants note that the Examiner has found claim 2 to be allowable and claims 4, 7, 9, 11, 14, and 16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

In view of the foregoing, claims 1 and 3 have been amended to include the recitation originally set forth in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants believe that they have overcome the Examiner's rejection, and claims 1 and 3 should be allowable.

Also, newly added independent claim 18 specifies that the functionalized styryl compound includes specific functional groups that were originally set forth on page 4, lines 21-23 of the written description. Inasmuch as these functional groups define over vinyl groups, newly added claim 18 is believed to be allowable. Likewise, newly added independent claim 21 incorporates the recitation of original claim 5 into claim 1.

### TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

The undersigned attorney and the Examiner conducted telephone interviews on December 7, 2006, and December 27, 2006. The undersigned attorney indicated that the response filed on September 20, 2006, included typographical errors within the reproduction of the claims; the typographical errors were not in the preliminary amendment dated January 10, 2005. In particular, the formula included within claim 2 was different than that included in the preliminary amendment. The same error occurred with respect to claim 11 in the September, 2006, response. This response includes the correct formula for claim 2. The formula is correct to the extent that it is consistent with the written description and the preliminary amendment filed on January 10, 2005.

The undersigned attorney and the Examiner also discussed during these


telephone interviews the fact that Applicant would, in the subject response, make further amendments to the claims in order to place them in better condition for allowance. In particular, the following amendments are now included in the subject response. Claim 11 has been cancelled. Claim 2 has been amended to recite that R<sup>5</sup> is a hydrogen atom or a hydrocarbyl group. Claims 1 and 3 have been amended to specify that the functionalized styryl compound is defined by the formula X and the variables have been defined in a manner consistent with the written description.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and arguments presented herein, the Applicants believe that they have properly set forth the invention and accordingly, respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the rejections provided in the last Office Action. A formal Notice of Allowance of claims 1-3 and 5-21 is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner care to discuss any of the foregoing in greater detail, the undersigned attorney would welcome a telephone call.

The Commissioner is specifically authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 06-0925 in the amount of \$200.00 for the payment of the addition of two additional independent claims. In the event that an additional fee is due or that any amount should be credited, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any additions fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-0925.

Respectfully submitted,



Arthur M. Reginelli, Reg. No. 40,139  
Renner, Kenner, Greive, Bobak, Taylor & Weber  
Fourth Floor, First National Tower  
Akron, Ohio 44308-1456  
Telephone: (330) 376-1242

Attorney for Applicants

January 3, 2007